

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed October 13, 2006, in the above-identified application.

New claim 16 is added. Therefore, claims 2-16 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

Claims 2-15 are amended to clarify features recited thereby. These amendments are fully supported by applicant's disclosure. For example, support for the amendment to claim 15 may be found at Specification, page 2, line 15 – page 3, line 19.

Rejection of Claims 3, 8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Joss et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,684,073 in view of McCombe, GB Patent 2,280,085, and McCann et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0029182. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

According to an aspect of applicant's invention as claimed in claim 15, a second data storage unit, such as data base 7, stores identifying data collected by a data analysis unit such that the network in which the mobile subscriber unit is currently located may be identified in one central data base. Accordingly, service module 8 can provide contracted advanced services (services that are not standard in the MAP (Mobile Application Protocol), GSM (Global System for Mobile Communications) or other protocols), to the mobile subscriber unit by referring only to the identifying data stored in the second data storage unit to identify the location of the mobile subscriber unit roaming in a foreign network.

Claim 15 requires a contracted service module operable to provide contracted advanced services to the mobile subscriber unit in the foreign network in real time by referring only to the identifying data stored in the second data storage unit to determine the location of the mobile subscriber unit.

Joss discloses a signaling method and conversion device for passing information between telecommunications networks in which a second subscriber identification number is assigned to a mobile terminal that is roaming in a visited network, when the visited network and the home

network do not have a roaming agreement (Joss, Abstract). Joss discloses HLRs (Home Location Registers) that keep track of subscribers in various portions of the home network.

Each home network may have several such HLRs. McCann discloses, for example, more than one HLR provided in a network (McCann, page 2, paragraph 13; Fig. 8). Therefore, several HLRs and VLRs (Visitor Location Registers) would need to be consulted to provide contracted advanced services that are not provided as part of the standard MAP.

It will be appreciated that while MAP provides for exchanging information between VLRs and HLRs, it does not provide for a central data repository of the type above-described. The Examiner cites Joss, column 2, lines 14-16, which discloses that the HLR of the first mobile network maintains information on the location of the roaming subscriber. However, the GSM standard does not define any method for accessing the information stored in the HLRs in a centralized way in real time for providing advanced services. An HLR of the home network does not contain information regarding in which foreign network each of the subscriber units is presently located. Accordingly, Joss does not disclose or suggest providing contracted advanced services to the mobile subscriber unit in the foreign network in real time by referring only to the identifying data stored in the second data storage unit to determine the location of the mobile subscriber unit, as recited in claim 15.

McCombe discloses a method to enable a subscriber of one type of wireless network to roam into a GSM type wireless network and allow the roamer to make calls and to bill the subscriber appropriately (McCombe, Abstract). McCann discloses routing signaling messages for a subscriber that has been ported out of a home network (McCann, Abstract). McCann and McCombe are silent with respect to the above-noted features of claim 15. Accordingly, even taken together in combination, Joss, McCann and McCombe do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 15.

Claims 3 and 8 depend from claim 15 and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Rejection of Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Joss, McCombe and McCann in view of Nilsson, WO 01/10109 A2. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Nilsson discloses a method of controlling charging for services for a subscriber of a home network when the subscriber is roaming in a foreign network by transferring from the home network to the foreign network charging events predefined for the subscriber (Nilsson, Abstract). Nilsson does not disclose or suggest the above-cited features of claim 15. Accordingly, Nilsson does not cure the above-cited deficiencies of Joss, McCombe and McCann as they relate to independent claim 15.

Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12-14 depend from claim 15 and accordingly claims 2, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12-14 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Joss, McCombe, McCann in view of Yamaguchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,002,931. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Yamaguchi does not cure the above-cited deficiencies of Joss, McCombe and McCann as they relate to the above-cited features of claim 15. Therefore, claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as claim 15 from which it depends.

Rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Joss, McCombe, McCann and Yamaguchi in view of Nilsson. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Even taken together in combination, Joss, McCombe, McCann, Yamaguchi and Nilsson do not disclose or suggest the above-cited features of claim 15, for the reasons discussed in the foregoing discussion. Claim 11 depends from claim 15. Therefore, claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

New Claim

New claim 16 is added so as more fully to claim patentable aspects of applicant's invention. Claim 16 is fully supported by applicant's disclosure. See, for example, Specification, page 5, lines 25-26.

Claim 16 depends from claim 15 and is therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON **APRIL 13, 2007**

RCF:GB:ns

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Faber
Registration No. 24,322
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700